

S.N. 10/540,230

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER2.
JAN 14 2009

ENTER

3/4/09 /PRW/

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 9, 11 to 24 and 29 to 45 are in the case.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 11, 14, 21, 29, 30, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the teachings of US Patent 4,180,070 to Genese. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth hereinbelow.

The rejection of the above claims is essentially the same rejection as made in the previous Office Action. In response thereto, the Examiner has argued, on page 2 of the Office Action, the housing is considered to be any part of the outer structure of the device. The Examiner has also stated that he interprets the term "engaging the neck" of a vial to mean that the side walls of the vial are held by the vial socket. Initially, this is not understood as the side walls of a vial and the neck are quite distinct from each other and any person knowledgeable in art would differentiate between the two. Furthermore, even given the interpretation taken by the Examiner, Genese does not teach that the side walls 18 of the vial are engaged by a vial socket as defined by walls 11 and 17. Figures 1 to 3 clearly show this not to be the case and in addition, Genese, in Column 2, lines 56 et seq clearly does not teach the arrangement as proposed by the Examiner.

In reviewing the Examiner's rejection, it appears that there would be some confusion as to the equivalency of components between what is shown in Genese and what Applicant is claiming. Although the overall goal for the functioning of the two devices may be similar, there is a completely different structure as will be described herein.

Claim 1 defines a housing having first and second open ends with a bore extending (through the housing) between the first and second open ends. The equivalent structure in